arXiv:1704.07868v1 [stat.ME] 25 Apr 2017

New robust statistical procedures for polytomous logistic regression models

Castilla, E.[1]; Ghosh, A[2]; Martín, N.[1] and Pardo, L.[1]
[1]Complutense University of Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain
[2]Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

April 27, 2017

Abstract

This paper develops a new family of estimators, MDPDEs, as a robust generalization of maximum likelihood estimator for the polytomous logistic regression model (PLRM) by using the DPD measure. Based on these estimators, the family of Wald-type test statistics for linear hypotheses is introduced and their robust properties are theoretically studied through the classical influence function analysis. Some numerical examples are presented to justify the requirement of a suitable robust statistical procedure of estimation in place of the MLE. Finally, a simulation study provides further confirmation of the validity of the theoretical results established in the paper.

MSC: 62F35, 62F05
Keywords: Influence function, Polytomous logistic regression, Minimum density power divergence estimators, Wald-type test statistics.

1 Introduction

The polytomous logistic regression model (PLRM) is widely used in health and life sciences (e.g. Ke et al (2016), Bertens et al (2015), Dey et al. (2016), Biesheuvel (2008), Bull et al (2007), Daniels et al. (1997), Blizzard et al (2007), Dreassi (2007) and references therein) as well as in other different areas where we need to analyze a nominal qualitative response taking values in a set of unordered categories. Examples of such response variables frequently occurring in medical and other applied sciences include disease symptoms that have been classified by subjects as being absent, mild, moderate, or severe or invasiveness of a tumor classified as in situ, locally invasive, ormetastatic. The qualitative response models specify the multinomial distribution to such a response variable with individual category probabilities being modeled as a function of some explanatory variables which might be nominal or interval (e.g., McCullagh and Nelder, 1989; Liu and Agresti, 2005). One such popular model is the PLRM that allows one to analyze simultaneously the effects of several explanatory variables on a multinomial response variable.

In order to describe the PLRM in a slightly more rigorous way, let us assume that the outcome variable Y is a nominal variable with $d+1$ categories $C_1, ..., C_{d+1}$ and we observe this response variable Y together with k explanatory variables $\boldsymbol{x}^T = (x_1, ..., x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$. Let $\pi_j\left(\boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = P(Y \in C_j \mid \boldsymbol{x})$, $j = 1, ..., d+1$, denote the probability that the random variable Y belongs to the category C_j,

$j = 1, ..., d+1$, when the explanatory variable is $\boldsymbol{x}$. We say that an observation $\boldsymbol{x}$ fulfils the logistic assumption if

$$\pi_j\left(\boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = \exp\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T\boldsymbol{x}\right) / \left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{d} \exp\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_l^T\boldsymbol{x}\right)\right),\ j = 1, ..., d+1, \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T = (\beta_{1j}, ..., \beta_{kj})$, $j = 1, ..., d$, is a vector of unknown parameters and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{d+1}$ is a k-dimensional vector of zeros; i.e., the last category, $d+1$, has been chosen to be the baseline category. Then the full parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}^T = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1^T, ..., \boldsymbol{\beta}_d^T)$ is ν-dimensional with $\nu = dk$ and hence our parameter space is given by

$$\Theta = \left\{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T = \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_1^T, ..., \boldsymbol{\beta}_d^T\right) \mid \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T = (\beta_{1j}, ..., \beta_{kj}), j = 1, ..., d : \beta_{sj} \in \mathbb{R},\ s = 1, .., k\right\}.$$

The model described in (1) is the classical *Polytomous Logistic Regression Model* (PLRM). For more details about this model, see Liu and Agresti (2005), Anderson (1972, 1982, 1984), Lesaffre (1986), Lesaffre and Albert (1989), McCullagh (1980) and the references therein.

Let us now assume that N different values of the vector of explanatory variables $\boldsymbol{x}_i^T = (x_{i1}, ..., x_{ik})$, for $i = 1, ..., N$, are available and given $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ the response variable $\boldsymbol{Y}_i = (Y_{i1}, ..., Y_{i,d+1})^T$ has the observed value $\boldsymbol{y}_i = (y_{i1}, ..., y_{i,d+1})^T$ with $y_{ir} = 1$ and $y_{is} = 0$ for $s \in \{1, ..., d+1\} - \{r\}$ if the i-th unit fall in category C_r, for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$. We want to estimate the parameters β_{js} $(j = 1, ..., k; s = 1, ..., d)$ based on this observed random sample $(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$, $i = 1 \ldots, N$. The most common way to estimate the parameters in this PLRM is the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE), which is obtained by maximizing the loglikelihood function

$$\log \prod_{i=1}^{N} \prod_{l=1}^{d+1} \pi_l\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{li}} \quad \equiv \log \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

We then do all the inferences based on the MLE $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Although it is known to have optimal properties in relation to the efficiency for most cases, its serious lack of robustness against the outlying points in data is also well-known. However, it is quite natural to have some outlying values in any practical dataset resulting in an incorrect inference which sometime can be very serious specially in applications like medical sciences etc. To further justify the requirement of a suitable robust statistical procedure of estimation in place of the MLE, let us present the following example.

Example 1 (Mammography experience data) *The mammography experience data set, which asseses factors associated with women's knowledge attitude and behavior towards mamography, was introduced in Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000) as a subset of the original main study of the University of Masachusets Medical School. Results of the study of this reduced data can also be found in Martín (2014).*

This mammography experience data set (which will be deeply studied in Section 5) involves $N = 412$ individuals grouped in $I = 125$ vectors of explanatory variables of dimension $k = 8$ and an outcome variable with $d + 1 = 3$ categories. Seven of these observations can be considered as outliers (see Martín, 2014). When we speak of robustness, we would like an estimator whose inferences would not be highly affected by the presence or absence of outliers. In this sense, and in order to justify the necesity of more robust estimators, we have calculated the MLE of the model for the full data set and

for the outliers deleted data set, and the corresponding probabilities for the observations when PLRM is applied to the data with these estimated parameters. The differences between both estimations are reflected in Figure 1. In Figure 1a we see, for the second category of the outcome variable, how estimated probabilities vary in an important way when outliers are not considered (orange) to the original estimated probabilities (blue). However, the fact of not considering the outliers observations is justified in Figure 1b, which shows the mean deviations of the estimated probabilities respect to the observated frequencies, which are always lower for the alternative estimators. This clearly illustrates the non-robust nature of the MLE and motivates us to look for a robust inference procedure that will generate stable results even without removing the outlying observations along with high efficiency.



(a) (b)

Figure 1: Mammography experience data set: expected probabilities (a), and expected mean deviations of the estimated probabilities respect to the observated frequencies (b), for the outcome variable.

There are also some alternative estimation procedures for PLRM other than the MLE, although less used in practice. These include the estimators proposed by Begg and Gray (1984) and its modification by Rom and Cohen (1995). The generalized method of moments (GMM) has also been considered as a substitute of MLE which, under some regularity conditions, is known to be consistent (Hansen, 1982). Hayashi (2000) established that, with an appropriate weight matrix, GMM achieves the same efficiency as the MLE. Gupta et al. (2006a) considered the PLRM with only categorical covariates and discussed the family of the minimum phi-divergence estimators (MϕEs) that also contains the MLE as a particular case. The MϕEs are BAN estimators and they have good properties of efficiency for moderate and small sample sizes in relation to the MLE. However, the important issue of robustness against outliers in data was ignored in all these cited references. Ronchetti and Trojani (2001) pointed out the problems with respect to the robustness for the GMM estimators. Recently, Wang (2014) gave a modification of the GMM estimator in order to achieve robustness and Victoria-Feser and Ronchetti (1997) presented a robust estimator for grouped data with categorical covariates only.

In this paper, we will present an alternative simple robust generalization of the MLE by using the density power divergence (DPD) measure (Basu et al, 1998). The DPD based inferences have become very popular in recent time specially because of their strong robustness properties against outliers in data; see for instance Basu et al. (2011, 2013, 2015, 2016), Ghosh et al. (2015, 2016) among others. In this paper, we are going to pay special attention to obtain robust inferences for the PLRM given by (1) based on the minimum DPD. We first develop the estimator of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in PLRM

by minimizing the suitably defined DPD measure as a natural extension of the MLE in Section 2, where we also describe its asymptotic distribution. In Section 3 we present the procedure of using this MDPDE to develop Wald-type test statistics for testing linear hypotheses about the parameters of the model. Then, we will theoretically study the robustness of the proposed estimators as well as the Wald-type tests through the classical influence function analysis in Section 4. In Section 5 we present some numerical examples and Section 6 is devoted to describe a simulation study. For the simplicity in presentation and to make ithelpful for a broad group of applied scientist using the PLRM for their datasets, we will move all the major technical details and proofs to the Appendix.

2 Minimum density power divergence estimator for the polytomous logistic regression model

We will first note that the MLE, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ under the PLRM given in (1) can be equivalently defined as the minimizer of the Kullback-Leibler divergence measure between the probability vectors

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}} = \left(\frac{y_{11}}{N}, ..., \frac{y_{1,d+1}}{N}, \frac{y_{12}}{N}, ..., \frac{y_{2,d+1}}{N}, ..., \frac{y_{1N}}{N}, ..., \frac{y_{N,d+1}}{N}\right)^T,$$

and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = & \left(\frac{1}{N}\left(\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{x}_1^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right), ..., \pi_{d+1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_1^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right), ..., \frac{1}{N}\left(\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{x}_N^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right), ..., \pi_{d+1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_N^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)\right)^T \\ = & \left(\frac{1}{N}\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_1^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^T, ..., \frac{1}{N}\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_N^T\ \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^T\right)^T, \end{array} \tag{2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^T$ denote the vector $\left(\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right), \ldots, \pi_{d+1}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)$. This is because the Kullback-Leibler divergence between $\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}$ and $\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ is given by

$$D_{KL}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}(\ \boldsymbol{\beta})\right) = \sum_{l=1}^{d+1}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\frac{y_{il}}{N}\log\frac{y_{il}}{\pi_l\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)} = c - \frac{1}{N}\log\prod_{i=1}^{N}\prod_{l=1}^{d+1}\pi_l\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{li}}, \tag{3}$$

where c does not depend on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and hence $D_{KL}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}(\ \boldsymbol{\beta})\right) \approx -\log\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ implying the alternative definition of the MLE $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ as

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\boldsymbol{\Theta}} D_{KL}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\right). \tag{4}$$

However, this Kullback-Leibler divergence measure is a particular case of the density power divergence (DPD) measure. So, we can similarly define the DPD measure between the two probability vectors $\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}$ and $\boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ as given by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} d_\lambda^*\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\right) & = & \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{l=1}^{d+1}\left\{\frac{1}{N^{1+\lambda}}\pi_l^{1+\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \left(1+\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)\left(\frac{y_{il}}{N}\right)\pi_l^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta})\frac{1}{N^{\lambda}} + \frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{y_{il}}{N}\right)^{1+\lambda}\right\} \\ & = & \displaystyle\frac{1}{N^{1+\lambda}}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\{\sum_{l=1}^{d+1}\pi_l^{1+\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \left(1+\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)\sum_{l=1}^{d+1}y_{il}\pi_l^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \frac{N}{\lambda}\right\}. \end{array} \tag{5}$$

But, in order to minimize $d_\lambda^*\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\right)$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, the term $\frac{N}{\lambda}$ in (5) do not have any role. For

this reason in the following we shall consider

$$d_\lambda\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{N^{1+\lambda}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} \pi_l^{1+\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \left(1+\frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} y_{il}\pi_l^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\} \tag{6}$$
$$= \frac{1}{N^{1+\lambda}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)$$

where

$$d_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right) = \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} \left[\pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \tfrac{1+\lambda}{\lambda} y_{il}\right] \pi_l^{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

Based on (4) and (6) we shall define the MDPDE for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the PLRM in the following way,

Definition 2 *The MDPDE for the parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ with tuning parameter λ, say $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$, in the PLRM is given by*

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\Theta} d_\lambda\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right),$$

where $d_\lambda\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)$ was defined in (6).

For $\lambda = 0$, the DPD (6) coincides with the Kullback-Leibler divergence (3), therefore the MDPDE of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ at $\lambda = 0$ contains as special case the MLE. In the next theorem we present the system of equations that need to be solved to obtain the MDPDE of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the PLRM.

Theorem 3 *The MDPDE, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$, of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ can be obtained by solving the system of equations*

$$\mathbf{0}_{dk} = \boldsymbol{u}_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{u}_{\lambda,i}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right),$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{u}_{\lambda,i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = \boldsymbol{\Delta}(\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right))\boldsymbol{h}_{2,\lambda}^*(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)) \otimes \boldsymbol{x}_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{7}$$

with $\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = \left(\pi_1\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right), ..., \pi_d\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\Delta}\left(\boldsymbol{s}\right) = \mathrm{Diag}\left(\boldsymbol{s}\right) - \boldsymbol{s}\boldsymbol{s}^T$ for any $\boldsymbol{s} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{2,\lambda}^*\left((s_1, \ldots, s_{d+1})^T, (t_1, \ldots, t_{d+1})^T\right) = \left(\left(\tfrac{s_1}{t_1} - 1\right) t_1^\lambda, \cdots, \left(\tfrac{s_d}{t_d} - 1\right) t_d^\lambda\right).$$

Proof. See Proof of Theorem 3 in Appendix. ■

Note that, here $\boldsymbol{Y}_i$ are independent but not identically distributed since the covariates $\boldsymbol{x}_i$s are generally assumed to be pre-fixed/given here (and hence different over i). In particular, for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, given $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $\boldsymbol{Y}_i$ has a multinomial distribution having probability mass function

$$f_i(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \prod_{l=1}^{d+1} \pi_l\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i\right)^{y_{li}}, \quad y_{li} \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for } l = 1, \ldots, d+1, \text{ with } \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} y_{li} = 1, \tag{8}$$

which can be equivalently re-expressed as

$$f_i(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} y_{li} \pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i), \quad y_{li} \in \{0,1\} \text{ for } l = 1, \ldots, d+1, \text{ with } \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} y_{li} = 1. \tag{9}$$

This distribution indeed belongs to the family of d-dimensional Generalized Linear Models (GLM), where the distribution of the transformed variable $\boldsymbol{Y}_i^*$ can be written as

$$f_i^*(\boldsymbol{y}_i^*, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \exp\left((\boldsymbol{y}_i^*)^T \boldsymbol{\eta}_i - b(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i)\right), \quad y_{li} \in \{0,1\} \text{ for } l = 1, \ldots, d+1,$$

with $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = (\eta_{i1}, \cdots, \eta_{id}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \boldsymbol{X}^T$ being $\boldsymbol{X}^T = \left(\boldsymbol{X}_1^T, ..., \boldsymbol{X}_N^T\right)_{kd \times dN}$ and

$$\boldsymbol{X}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{x}_i^T & \boldsymbol{0}^T & ... & \boldsymbol{0}^T \\ \boldsymbol{0}^T & \boldsymbol{x}_i^T & ... & \boldsymbol{0}^T \\ . & . & . & . \\ \boldsymbol{0}^T & \boldsymbol{0}^T & ... & \boldsymbol{x}_i^T \end{pmatrix}_{d \times dk}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{10}$$

and $b(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i) = \log\left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^{d} e^{\eta_{il}}\right)$.

Further, since the random variables $\boldsymbol{Y}_i$ under the PLRM are independent but not identically distributed given $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, we can apply the general results from Ghosh and Basu (2013) to study the properties of the MDPDE under PLRM. In fact, it can be verified that the minimization of the intuitive objective function (6) here is equivalent to the minimization of the average DPD measure between the observed data and the model probability mass function over each different distributions (indexed by i) as proposed in Ghosh and Basu (2013) for the general non-homogeneous set-up. This general objective function of Ghosh and Basu (2013) is given by

$$H_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} f_i(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta})^{1+\lambda} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) f_i(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta})^{\lambda} \right\},$$

which can be simplified by using (8) and (9) to

$$H_N(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} d_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)$$

and hence becomes equivalent to (6). Similarly the general estimating equation of the MDPDE presented in Ghosh and Basu (2013) can be checked to have the simple form as given in Theorem 3 for the present case of PLRM. Hence, we can obtain the asymptotic properties of our MDPDE under PLRM from the general theory of Ghosh and Basu (2013) which is presented in the next theorem.

Theorem 4 *Consider the PLRM as above with true value of parameter being $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$. Under Assumptions (A1)–(A7) of Ghosh and Basu (2013), there exists a consistent sequence of roots $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ of the MDPDE estimating equations $\boldsymbol{u}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \boldsymbol{0}_{dk}$ as given in Theorem 3 and*

$$\sqrt{N}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right) \underset{N \to \infty}{\overset{L}{\to}} \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{J}_\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \boldsymbol{V}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \boldsymbol{J}_\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\right),$$

where $\boldsymbol{J}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ *and* $\boldsymbol{V}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{N,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ *being*

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big[diag\{\boldsymbol{h}^*_{1,1+\lambda}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)\} - 2\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\boldsymbol{h}^*_{1,1+\lambda}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)^T \\ &\qquad + C_\lambda\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^T\Big]\otimes\boldsymbol{x}_i\boldsymbol{x}_i^T, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{N,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big\{\Big[diag\{\boldsymbol{h}^*_{1,1+2\lambda}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)\} - 2\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\boldsymbol{h}^*_{1,1+2\lambda}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)^T \\ &\qquad + C_{2\lambda}\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^T\Big]\otimes\boldsymbol{x}_i\boldsymbol{x}_i^T - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\,\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta})^T\Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

with $\boldsymbol{h}^*_{1,\lambda}(s_1,\ldots,s_d,s_{d+1}) = \left(s_1^\lambda,\ldots,s_d^\lambda\right)$, $C_\lambda = \sum_{l=1}^{d+1}\pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i)^{1+\lambda}$ *and*

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \left[\boldsymbol{h}^*_{1,1+\lambda}\left(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right) - C_\lambda\boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right]\otimes\boldsymbol{x}_i, \quad i=1,\ldots,N. \tag{13}$$

Proof. See Proof of Theorem 4 in Appendix. ■

3 Wald-type test statistics for testing linear hypotheses

Most of the testing problems for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the PLRM are linear hypotheses of the form

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{L}^{\boldsymbol{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{l} \text{ against } H_1 : \boldsymbol{L}^{\boldsymbol{T}}\boldsymbol{\beta} \neq \boldsymbol{l} \tag{14}$$

where $\boldsymbol{L}$ is $dk \times s$ matrix with full row rank $s \leq dk$. Two important particular cases are presented when we are interested in testing

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \text{ against } H_1 : \boldsymbol{\beta} \neq \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$$

or

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\beta}_r = \boldsymbol{0} \text{ against } H_1 : \boldsymbol{\beta}_r \neq \boldsymbol{0}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_r$ is a subvector of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

We shall denote by $\boldsymbol{M}_{N,\lambda}(\widehat{\beta}_\lambda)$ the matrix defined by $\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{N,\lambda}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right)\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{N,\lambda}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right)\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{N,\lambda}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right)$. In the following definition we present the family of Wald-type test statistics for testing linear hypotheses of the type (14) in the PLRM.

Definition 5 *Let* $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ *the MDPDE of* $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ *in the PLRM. The family of Wald-type test statistics for testing the null hypothesis given in (14) has the expression.*

$$W_N\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right) = N\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l}\right)^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{M}_{N,\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda)\boldsymbol{L}\right)^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l}\right) \tag{15}$$

In the particular case of $\lambda = 0$, i.e. when $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ is the MLE, we get the classical Wald-test statistic because in this case

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\lambda=0}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda=0}\right)\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{N,\lambda=0}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda=0}\right)\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\lambda=0}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda=0}\right)=\boldsymbol{X}^T\boldsymbol{V}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda=0}\right)\boldsymbol{X},$$

i.e., the Fisher information matrix for the PLRM and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\lambda=0}$ is the maximum likelihood estimator, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Theorem 6 *The asymptotic distribution of the Wald-type test statistics, $W_N\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right)$, defined in (15), under the null hypothesis given in (14), is a chi-square distribution with s degrees of freedom.*

Proof. See Proof of Theorem 6 in Appendix. ■

Based on the previous theorem the null hypothesis given in (14) will be rejected if we have that

$$W_N\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right)>\chi_{s,\alpha}^2 \tag{16}$$

Now we consider $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\in\Theta$ such that $\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\neq\boldsymbol{l}$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ does not belong to the null hypothesis. We denote

$$l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_2)=\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_1-\boldsymbol{l}\right)^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_2\right)\boldsymbol{L}\right)^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_1-\boldsymbol{l}\right) \tag{17}$$

and we are going to get an approximation to the power function for the Wald-type test statistics with the rejection rule given in (16)

Theorem 7 *Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\in\Theta$ with $\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\neq\boldsymbol{l}$ the true value of the parameter so that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{P}\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$. The power function of the Wald-type test statistics given in (16), in $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$, is given by*

$$\pi_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)=1-\phi_N\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)}\left(\frac{\chi_{s,\alpha}^2}{\sqrt{N}}-\sqrt{N}l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right)\right) \tag{18}$$

where $\phi_N\left(x\right)$ tends uniformly to the standard normal distribution $\phi\left(x\right)$ and $\sigma_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)$ is given by

$$\sigma_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)^2=4\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^*-\boldsymbol{l}\right)^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)\boldsymbol{L}\right)^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^*-\boldsymbol{l}\right).$$

Proof. See Proof of Theorem 7 in Appendix. ■

Remark 8 *Based on the previous theorem we can obtain the sample size necessary to get a fix power. $\pi_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)=\pi_0$. By (18) we must solve the equation*

$$1-\pi_0=\phi\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)}\left(\frac{\chi_{s,\alpha}^2}{\sqrt{N}}-\sqrt{N}l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right)\right)$$

and we get that $N=[N^*]+1$ with

$$N^*=\frac{A+B+\sqrt{A(A+2B)}}{2l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)^2}$$

being $A=\sigma_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right)^2\left(\phi^{-1}\left(1-\pi_0\right)\right)^2$ and $B=\frac{1}{2}\chi_{s,\alpha}^2 l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)$ and $l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)$ is given in (17).

We may also find an approximation of the power function for the Wald-type test statistics with the rejection rule given in (17) at an alternative hypothesis close to the null hypothesis. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$ with $\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta_N} \neq \boldsymbol{l}$ be a given alternative hypothesis and let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ be the element such that $\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \boldsymbol{l}$ closest to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$ in the Euclidean distance sense. A first possibility to introduce contiguous alternative hypotheses is to consider a fixed $\boldsymbol{d} \in \mathbb{R}^{kd}$ and to permit $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$ moving towards $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ as N increases in the following way

$$H_{1,N} : \boldsymbol{\beta}_N = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + N^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{d}. \tag{19}$$

A second approach is to relax the condition $\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \boldsymbol{l}$ defining the null hypothesis. Let $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^{kd}$ and consider the following sequence, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N$, of parameters moving towards $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ according to

$$H^*_{1,N} : \boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_N - \boldsymbol{l} = N^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\delta}. \tag{20}$$

Note that

$$\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_N - \boldsymbol{l} = \boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{L}^T\, N^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{d} - \boldsymbol{l} = \boldsymbol{L}^T N^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{d}. \tag{21}$$

Then the equivalence between the two hypotheses is given by

$$\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{d} = \boldsymbol{\delta}. \tag{22}$$

If we denote by $\chi^2_r(\Delta)$ the non central chi-square distribution with r degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter Δ, we can state the following theorem.

Theorem 9 *We have*

i) $W_N\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \chi^2_s\left(\Delta_1\right)$ *under* $H_{1,N}$ *given in (19), with* $\Delta_1 = \boldsymbol{d}^T\boldsymbol{L}\left[\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right)\boldsymbol{L}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{d}$.

ii) $W_N(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \chi^2_s\left(\Delta_2\right)$ *under* $H^*_{1,N}$ *given in (20), with* $\Delta_2 = \boldsymbol{\delta}^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right)\boldsymbol{L}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{\delta}$.

Proof. See Proof of Theorem 9 in Appendix. ■

4 Robustness Properties

We first study the robustness of the proposed MDPDE under the PLRM through the classical influence function analysis (Hampel et al., 1986). For any estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \boldsymbol{U}(G_n)$ defined in terms of a statistical functional $\boldsymbol{U}(\cdot)$ and the empirical distribution G_n based on iid data, its influence function is defined as

$$\mathcal{IF}\left(t, \boldsymbol{U}, G\right) = \lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\frac{\boldsymbol{U}(G_\epsilon) - \boldsymbol{U}(G)}{\epsilon} = \left.\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{U}(G_\epsilon)}{\partial\epsilon}\right|_{\epsilon=0},$$

where G is the underlying true distribution of data, and $G_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)G + \epsilon\wedge_t$ is its contaminated version with ϵ being the contamination proportion and $\wedge_t$ being the degenerate distribution an the contamination point t. Thus, the above (first order) influence function, as a function of the contamination point t, measures the standardized asymptotic bias (in its first order approximation) due to the infinitesimal contamination at the point t. Thus, whenever the influence function is bounded in t, the bias cannot explore even if we take the contamination point t far away from data center indicating the local robustness of the estimator. On the other hand, if the influence function is unbounded

the associated bias explores and the estimator is non-robust. Further, the maximum of this influence function over t indicates the extent of bias due to contamination and hence lower its value more robust the estimator is.

For the present case of PLRM, given $\boldsymbol{x}_i$, $\boldsymbol{y}_i$s are independent but not-identically distributed. The extended definition of influence functions for such non-homogeneous cases has been proposed in Huber (1983) and Ghosh and Basu (2013, 2016). Following their approach, let us assume G_i denotes the true underlying distribution of $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ with density f_i. Whenever the assumption of PLRM holds with true parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$, we must have $g_i(\boldsymbol{y}_i) = f_i(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$. Denote $\underline{\boldsymbol{G}} = (G_1, \cdots, G_N)$ and $\underline{\boldsymbol{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (F_1(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}), \cdots, F_N(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))$. Then, the statistical functional $\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda(\underline{\boldsymbol{G}})$ corresponding to the proposed MDPDE $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ is to be defined as the minimizer of

$$H(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\{ \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} f_i(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta})^{1+\lambda} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\lambda}\right) \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} f_i(\boldsymbol{y}, \boldsymbol{\beta})^{\lambda} g_i(\boldsymbol{y}) \right\},$$

whenever it exists. Further, note that, in such cases the outliers can be either in any one g_i or in some or all g_is. Following the general results from Ghosh and Basu (2013), one can derive that the influence functions of the proposed MDPDE at the model distribution $\underline{\boldsymbol{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}$ are given by

$$IF_{i_0}(\boldsymbol{t}_{i_0}; \boldsymbol{U}_\lambda, \underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}) = \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\lambda}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \frac{1}{N} \left[\left(\sum_{l=1}^{d+1} t_{li_0} \pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_{i_0})^{\lambda} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{t}_{i_0}^* - \boldsymbol{\pi}^* \left(\boldsymbol{x}_{i_0}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} \right) \right) \otimes \boldsymbol{x}_{i_0} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i_0,\lambda} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right]$$

when there is contamination in only one, namely i_0-th direction at the point $\boldsymbol{t}_{i_0}$ and

$$IF(\boldsymbol{t}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{t}_N; \boldsymbol{U}_\lambda, \underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}) = \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\tau}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[\left(\sum_{l=1}^{d+1} t_{li} \pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i)^{\lambda} \right) \left(\boldsymbol{t}_i^* - \boldsymbol{\pi}^* \left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right) \otimes \boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right]$$

when the contamination is in all the N distributions G_i at the points $\boldsymbol{t}_i$s respectively for $i = 1, \ldots, N$; here $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ is as defined in Equation (13). Note that, these influence functions are bounded in large $\boldsymbol{x}_i$s (leverage points) for all $\lambda > 0$, but unbounded for $\lambda = 0$ which is the case of classical MLE. This shows that the proposed MDPDE with $\lambda > 0$ will be robust against leverage points, although the classical MLE is non-robust against them. However, we cannot directly infer about the robustness against outliers in the response variable which are in fact the misspecification error. This is because is such cases $\boldsymbol{t}_i$ changes its indicative category only (does not go to infinity) and the influence functions are bounded in $\boldsymbol{t}_i$s for all $\lambda \geq 0$. But, it is well studies that the classical MLE at $\lambda = 0$ is highly non-robust against this misspecification errors. We will further illustrate the strong robustness of our proposed MDPDE with $\lambda > 0$ also against such misspecification errors empirically in the next two sections.

Similarly, we can also study the robustness of the proposed Wald-type tests for testing general linear hypotheses under the PLRM. The influence function of a testing procedure, as introduced by introduced by Rousseeuw and Ronchetti (1979) for i.i.d. data, is defined a before with the statistical functional associated with the test statistics and evaluate it under the distribution specified by the null hypothesis. This concept has been extended to the case of non-homogeneous data, which is the case here, by Ghosh and Basu (2015), Aerts and Haesbroeck (2016) and Basu et al. (2016); the last one consider the general Wald-type test statistics for the general non-homogeneous set-up. Let us

now define the statistical functional corresponding to our proposed Wald-type test statistics (15) as (ignoring the multiplier N)

$$T_\lambda\left(\underline{\boldsymbol{G}}\right)=\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda(\underline{\boldsymbol{G}})-\boldsymbol{l}\right)^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda(\underline{\boldsymbol{G}}))\boldsymbol{L}\right)^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda(\underline{\boldsymbol{G}})-\boldsymbol{l}\right), \tag{23}$$

where $\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda(\underline{\boldsymbol{G}})$ is the functional corresponding to MDPDE. Then, again we can have contamination in either one or all distributions as discussed above and the corresponding influence functions for the test functional can be obtained from the general theory of Basu et al. (2015). Letting $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ be the parameter value under the null distribution in (14), one can verify that the above (first order) influence functions in either case of contamination is identically zero at the null distribution $\underline{\boldsymbol{G}}=\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}$.

Thus the first order bias approximation is not much informative in this case Wald-type test statistics and we need to study the second order bias approximation, which is quantified through the second order influence functions. The second order influence function of the function $T(\cdot)$ is defined as the second derivative of its value under contaminated distribution with respect to the contamination proportion ϵ evaluated at $\epsilon\downarrow 0$. Following the approach of Basu et al. (2016), one can easily derive this second order influence functions of proposed Wald-type test functional in (23) in either cases of contamination, In particular, at the null distribution $\underline{\boldsymbol{G}}=\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
IF^{(2)}_{i_0}(\boldsymbol{t}_{i_0};T_\lambda,\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}) &= 2IF_{i_0}(\boldsymbol{t}_{i_0};\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda,\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0})^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\left[\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\boldsymbol{L}^T\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{L}\right)IF_{i_0}(\boldsymbol{t}_{i_0};\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda,\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0})\\
IF^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{t}_1,\cdot,\boldsymbol{t}_N;T_\lambda,\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}) &= 2IF(\boldsymbol{t}_1,\cdot,\boldsymbol{t}_N;\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda,\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0})^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\left[\boldsymbol{L}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\boldsymbol{L}^T\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{L}\right)IF(\boldsymbol{t}_1,\cdot,\boldsymbol{t}_N;\boldsymbol{U}_\lambda,\underline{\mathbf{F}}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_0}),
\end{aligned}$$

for contamination only in i_0-th distribution or in all distributions respectively (as in the case of estimation above). Clearly, the boundedness of the influence functions of the proposed Wald-type test statistics directly depend on the corresponding influence functions of the MDPDE used in constructing the test statistics. Hence, the proposed Wald-type tests with $\lambda>0$ are expected to be as the corresponding MDPDEs are so, whereas the classical Wald test at $\lambda=0$ is non-robust due to the non-robust nature of the involved MDPPDE at $\lambda=0$, i.e., the MLE. We will investigate these robustness properties of the testing procedure in different PLRM further through real data examples and simulations in the next two sections of the paper.

5 Numerical Examples

5.1 Mammography experience data (Hosmer and Lemeshow)

In this section we will study in depth the mammography experience data set presented in the introduction. As mentioned before, this data set involves N = 412 individuals grouped in $I=125$ vectors of explanatory variables of dimension $k=8$. Three variables are associated to the four categories of variable SYMPT ('You do not need a mammogram unless you develop symptoms': 1, strongly agree; 2, agree; 3, disagree; 4, strongly disagree), another with one of the two categories of variable HIST ('Mother or sister with a history of breast cancer': 1, no; 2, yes), the same with one of the two categories of variable BSE ('Has anyone taught you how to examine your own breasts?': 1, no; 2, yes), other two variables are associated with two of the three categories of variable DETC ('How likely is it that a mammogram could find a new case of breast cancer?': 1, not likely; 2, somewhat likely; 3, very likely) and finally a last quantitative variable is associated to PB ("Perceived benefit of mammography": values between 5 and 20 so that the lowest value represents the highest benefit

perception). The response variable ME (Mammography experience) is a categorical factor with three levels: "Never", "Within a Year" and "Over a Year".

We will consider a PLRM with $(k+1)\times d = 9\times 2 = 18$ parameters (two of them corresponding to the intercepts), in which the probabilities are given by equation (1). As suggested in Martín (2014), observations 1, 3, 17, 35, 75, 81, and 102 are outliers, so results for estimators with and without these observations are presented in Table 1 and Table 2. These tables show the MDPEs with tuning parameter $\lambda \in \{0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, \ldots, 1\}$. One important difference between both tables is observed in the parameter β_{BSE2}. Estimators of β_{BSE2} in Table 1 are all negative while estimators of β_{BSE2} in Table 2 are all positive, this is, when outliers are deleted, the relationship between the variable BSE and the second category of the response variable is estimated to have the opposite direction. Although it happens with all the values of the tunuing parameter λ, MDPEs with medium values of λ are quite near to be zero, and therfore, may not be significantly different from the corresponding positive values in the outlier deleted data. However, it seems difficult to make a comparison betwwen the behavior of the MDPEs only with this information, so it is necessary to make a deeper study of the robustness and efficiency of the MDPEs in this example.

Study of the Efficiency

In order to study the efficiency of the MDPDEs in the Mammography experience data, and as we don't now the true parameter vector, we have calculated the estimated mean deviations of the predicted probabilities with respect to the observed frequencies of the response variable when the outliers are considered or ignored. These are defined as

$$\boldsymbol{md}(\widehat{p}, \boldsymbol{\pi}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\lambda})) = (\widehat{md}_1^{\lambda}, \widehat{md}_2^{\lambda}, \widehat{md}_3^{\lambda}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}^{(i} - \boldsymbol{\pi}^{(i}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\lambda}) \right|$$

Results presented in Table 3 show, as expected the MLE yields the minimum average estimated mean deviation and hence leads to the highest efficiency when the outliers are eliminated. This efficiency is lower when λ increases, but the loss in efficiency is not quite significant. When the simulation study is described in the next section, result will show this same behaviour for pure data.

Study of the Robustness

Considering the results from Table 3 in presence of outliers, we can see that the average estimated mean deviations of the predicted probabilities with respect to the observed frequencies decreases significantly as we increase λ from 0 (corresponds to the MLE). This illustrates the increasing robustness of our proposed MDPDEs with increasing $\lambda > 0$.

In order to further evaluate the robustness of the MDPEs for the PLRM considered for the mamography experience data, we have calculated the mean deviations between predicted probabilities for the data once the estimators have been obtained considering or ignoring the outliers. Results are presented in Table 4 and clearly show when λ increases the correspondent MDPE is more robust.

This behavior is illustrated in Figure 2, where predicted probabilities for each observation are shown for the values of the tuning parameter $\lambda = 0$ (MLE, left) and $\lambda = 0.7$ (right). The differences between blue and orange points, corresponding to the outlier deleted data and the full data respectively, are more significant when the classical MLE estimators are computed. On the other hand the results for the MDPDE with $\lambda = 0.7$ are much more robust.

Table 1: Minimum density power divergence estimators for mamography data

λ	$\widehat{\beta}_1^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT11}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT12}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT13}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{HIST1}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{BSE1}^{\lambda}$
0	-1.5787	1.1096	1.4157	0.3151	1.0685	1.0620
0.1	-1.6511	1.1699	1.3808	0.3249	1.0978	1.0706
0.2	-1.7270	1.2352	1.3607	0.3482	1.1193	1.1048
0.3	-1.7944	1.3256	1.3284	0.3585	1.1653	1.1745
0.4	-1.9113	1.3119	1.2913	0.3458	1.2427	1.2872
0.5	-2.0629	1.3763	1.2666	0.3371	1.3288	1.3704
0.6	-2.1549	1.4995	1.2402	0.3293	1.3743	1.3928
0.7	-2.2114	1.6137	1.2164	0.3188	1.4001	1.3812
0.8	-2.2511	1.7101	1.1955	0.3044	1.4186	1.3456
0.9	-2.2846	1.786	1.1754	0.2858	1.4294	1.301
1	-2.3139	1.8401	1.156	0.2646	1.4343	1.2574
λ	$\widehat{\beta}_{DETC11}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{DETC12}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{PB1}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_2^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT21}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT22}^{\lambda}$
0	-0.6689	0.236	0.1485	1.4446	-1.3661	-0.9276
0.1	-0.5903	0.2141	0.1548	1.3131	-1.4693	-0.9747
0.2	-0.5265	0.1889	0.1616	1.1912	-1.6064	-1.0177
0.3	-0.4563	0.1729	0.1650	1.0880	-1.7353	-1.0571
0.4	-0.3068	0.1688	0.1724	1.0336	-1.7867	-1.0618
0.5	0.0080	0.1472	0.1832	0.9214	-1.7641	-1.0453
0.6	0.2614	0.1151	0.1919	0.8251	-1.7182	-1.0412
0.7	0.4167	0.0842	0.1986	0.7629	-1.6787	-1.0418
0.8	0.5100	0.0523	0.2041	0.7219	-1.6453	-1.0422
0.9	0.5619	0.0186	0.2101	0.6907	-1.6174	-1.0393
1	0.5878	-0.0137	0.2164	0.6675	-1.5848	-1.0309
λ	$\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT23}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{HIST2}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{BSE2}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{DETC21}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{DETC22}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{PB2}^{\lambda}$
0	-0.2155	-0.3005	-0.2298	-1.5812	-0.6534	-0.0710
0.1	-0.1978	-0.2761	-0.2517	-1.7736	-0.7238	-0.0540
0.2	-0.1724	-0.2540	-0.2386	-1.8798	-0.7922	-0.0392
0.3	-0.1610	-0.1980	-0.1797	-1.9429	-0.8414	-0.0310
0.4	-0.1711	-0.1776	-0.0967	-1.9037	-0.8815	-0.0243
0.5	-0.1819	-0.1364	-0.0562	-1.6614	-0.9420	-0.0119
0.6	-0.1949	-0.0954	-0.0709	-1.4194	-1.0084	-0.0012
0.7	-0.2120	-0.0677	-0.0914	-1.2394	-1.0703	0.0065
0.8	-0.2337	-0.0484	-0.1127	-1.0941	-1.1362	0.0125
0.9	-0.2594	-0.0387	-0.1358	-0.9758	-1.2097	0.0186
1	-0.2876	-0.0362	-0.1559	-0.8796	-1.2855	0.0245

When dealing with a data set, it would be desirable that a test decission wouldn't change depending on considering the outliers or ignoring them. In this case we are interested to test the significance of the first variable associated to the variable SYMPT, i.e. the null hypothesis is $H_0 : \beta_{SYMPT11} = \beta_{SYMPT12} = 0$. The p-value of the classical Wald test (at $\lambda = 0$) under the full data is 0.068, and in

Table 2: Minimum density power divergence estimators for mamography data without outliers (observations 1, 3, 17, 35, 75, 81, and 102)

λ	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_1^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT11}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT12}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT13}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{HIST1}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{BSE1}^{\lambda}$
0	-1.8925	1.4266	1.3669	0.3256	1.1116	1.6248
0.1	-1.9181	1.4846	1.3406	0.3303	1.1473	1.6814
0.2	-1.9530	1.4341	1.3124	0.3184	1.2141	1.7322
0.3	-2.0763	1.3997	1.3008	0.3252	1.299	1.8002
0.4	-2.1994	1.4703	1.2857	0.334	1.3638	1.8316
0.5	-2.2740	1.5918	1.2690	0.3386	1.4018	1.8104
0.6	-2.3082	1.7108	1.2544	0.3381	1.4271	1.7601
0.7	-2.3281	1.7978	1.2461	0.3338	1.4402	1.6934
0.8	-2.3598	1.8798	1.2411	0.3231	1.4688	1.6183
0.9	-2.3616	1.8963	1.2391	0.3148	1.5180	1.5919
1	-2.3914	1.9706	1.2271	0.2943	1.5283	1.4638
λ	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{DETC11}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{DETC12}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{PB1}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_2^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT21}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT22}^{\lambda}$
0	-0.3568	0.2915	0.1793	1.5959	-5.4674	-1.3728
0.1	-0.3155	0.2298	0.1806	1.5181	-4.5081	-1.2968
0.2	-0.2328	0.1896	0.1801	1.4976	-3.7857	-1.2253
0.3	-0.0204	0.1807	0.1862	1.4111	-3.1953	-1.1531
0.4	0.2309	0.1591	0.195	1.2880	-2.7678	-1.0862
0.5	0.4338	0.1286	0.2015	1.1915	-2.4453	-1.0338
0.6	0.5676	0.0986	0.2045	1.1360	-2.2082	-0.995
0.7	0.6432	0.0721	0.207	1.1174	-2.0422	-0.9631
0.8	0.6927	0.0440	0.2094	1.1162	-1.9315	-0.9355
0.9	0.7257	0.0441	0.2038	1.1455	-1.8532	-0.8839
1	0.7227	0.0063	0.2089	1.1462	-1.7657	-0.8674
λ	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{SYMPT23}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{HIST2}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{BSE2}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{DETC21}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{DETC22}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{PB2}^{\lambda}$
0	-0.3246	-0.4810	0.1545	-4.4961	-0.5605	-0.0756
0.1	-0.3105	-0.4198	0.2659	-3.6716	-0.6706	-0.0711
0.2	-0.3158	-0.3607	0.3383	-3.0346	-0.7600	-0.0736
0.3	-0.3074	-0.3102	0.4025	-2.4822	-0.8003	-0.0681
0.4	-0.3004	-0.2556	0.4036	-2.0631	-0.8515	-0.0573
0.5	-0.2997	-0.2048	0.3459	-1.7300	-0.9100	-0.049
0.6	-0.3054	-0.1604	0.2685	-1.4688	-0.9677	-0.0454
0.7	-0.3175	-0.1420	0.2092	-1.2732	-1.0205	-0.0437
0.8	-0.3369	-0.1310	0.1663	-1.1216	-1.0774	-0.0434
0.9	-0.3511	-0.0924	0.1685	-1.0401	-1.093	-0.0527
1	-0.3806	-0.1013	0.1065	-0.8946	-1.1813	-0.0492

the outlier deleted data it becomes 0.24, much higher. With a significance level around $\alpha = 0.05$ the decission of the test is not clear for low values of λ in presence of outliers. This non-robust inference doesn't occur for the Wald-type tests with $\lambda \geq 0.3$ (see Figure 3).

Table 3: Estimated mean deviations of the predicted probabilities with respect to the observed frequencies for the mammography data with and without outliers

	With Outliers				Without Outliers			
λ	$\widehat{md}_1^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_2^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_3^{\lambda}$	$\overline{\widehat{md}}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{md}_1^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{md}_2^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{md}_3^{\lambda}$	${}^*\overline{\widehat{md}}^{\lambda}$
0	0.2497	0.1627	0.2244	0.2123	0.2333	0.1424	0.2130	0.1962
0.1	0.2481	0.1611	0.2241	0.2111	0.2331	0.1443	0.2126	0.1967
0.2	0.2465	0.1600	0.2234	0.2100	0.2333	0.1459	0.2128	0.1973
0.3	0.2446	0.1592	0.2221	0.2086	0.2325	0.1479	0.212	0.1975
0.4	0.2424	0.1590	0.2202	0.2072	0.2311	0.1497	0.2105	0.1971
0.5	0.2393	0.1596	0.2174	0.2054	0.2299	0.1511	0.2097	0.1969
0.6	0.2368	0.1600	0.2156	0.2041	0.2293	0.1521	0.2096	0.1970
0.7	0.2354	0.1604	0.2147	0.2035	0.2293	0.1530	0.2097	0.1973
0.8	0.2346	0.1609	0.2144	0.2033	0.2293	0.1539	0.2102	0.1978
0.9	0.2342	0.1614	0.2145	0.2034	0.2296	0.1546	0.211	0.1984
1	0.2341	0.1621	0.2147	0.2036	0.2302	0.1559	0.2121	0.1994

5.2 Liver enzyme data (Plomteux)

Plomteux (1980) showed that four level of hepatitis could be defined based on three liver function tests: aspartate aminotransferase (AST), alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and glutamate dehygrogenase (GIDH). They presented a data set (Albert and Harris, 1987) that consists on 218 patients which hepatitis level is categorized as 1=acute viral hepatitis, 2=persistent chronic hepatitis, 3=aggressive chronic hepatitis and 4=post-necrotic cirrhosis. There are 57 patients in the response category 1, 44 are in category 2, 40 are in category 3 and 77 in category 4. The Plomteaux data set has been considered in several statistical literature; see, for exapmle, Lessafre and Albert (1989), Lesafre and Albert (1987), Bull et al. (1994) Muñoz-Pichardo et al (2011) and Martín (2014).

We will consider the PLRM given in (1), with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T = (\beta_j, \beta_{ASTj}, \beta_{ALTj}, \beta_{GLDHj})$, $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\boldsymbol{x} = (1, log\ \text{AST}, log\ \text{ALT}, log\ \text{GLDH})^T$. As suggested by the results in Martín (2014), observations $93, 101, 108, 116, 131$ and 136 can be considered outliers. Table 5 shows the estimated parameters of the model with and without outliers, while Table 6 presents the estimated mean deviations of the predicted probabilities with respect to the observed frequencies. In this case, all the MDPEs present a more efficient behaviour than MLE even after removing the indicated outliers; this indicates that perhaps there are still some masked outliers left in the data which were unidentified by the existing studies and hence illustrates the advantage of the proposed MDPDEs under such cases.

Table 7 shows the mean deviations between predicted probabilities for the data once the estmators have been obtained considering or ignoring the outliers. Medium and high positive values of the tuning paramteter show lesser deviation than that corresponding to the MLE and hence indicates their strong robustness properties.

On the other hand, we are interested in testing the importance of the intercept and aspartate aminotransferase variable in aggressive chronic hepatitis diagnostic, i.e, the null hypothesis is $H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_{AST2} = 0$. P-values are shown in Figure 4. For low values of λ the decission for the test with significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ varies depending on the presence or absence of outliers.

Table 4: Mean deviations between predicted probabilities with and without outliers, mammography data

λ	$\widehat{md}_1^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_2^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_3^{\lambda}$	$\overline{\widehat{md}}^{\lambda}$
0	0.0423	0.0295	0.0244	0.0321
0.1	0.0382	0.0254	0.0231	0.0289
0.2	0.0344	0.0231	0.0218	0.0264
0.3	0.0329	0.0205	0.0216	0.0250
0.4	0.0313	0.0177	0.0209	0.0233
0.5	0.0265	0.0165	0.0164	0.0198
0.6	0.0224	0.0159	0.0129	0.0171
0.7	0.0194	0.0157	0.0108	0.0153
0.8	0.0177	0.0159	0.0101	0.0146
0.9	0.0167	0.0170	0.011	0.0149
1	0.0151	0.0168	0.0100	0.0139

6 Simulation Study

6.1 Performance of the MDPDE

In this Section, we will carry out a simulation study to compare the behavior of some MDPDEs with respect to the MLE for the parameters in the PLRM. In order to analyze the performance of the proposed MDPDEs, as well as the MLEs, we consider the mean square errors (MSEs).

We have considered an outcome nominal variable $\boldsymbol{Y}$ with $d+1=3$ categories depending on $k=2$ explanatory variables x_1 and x_2. The value of the true probability asociated with the j-th category is

$$\pi_j\left(\boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)=\frac{\exp\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^T\boldsymbol{x}\right)}{1+\sum_{l=1}^{2}\exp\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_l^T\boldsymbol{x}\right)},\quad j=1,2,3 \tag{24}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}=(\beta_{01},\beta_{11},\beta_{21},\beta_{02},\beta_{12},\beta_{22})^T=(0,-0.9,0.1,0.6,-1.2,0.8)^T$. To study the behaviour of the model, N independent units are generated, where $x_1^{(i)}\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, $x_2^{(i)}\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{(i}\sim\mathcal{M}\left(1;\pi_1(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)}),\pi_2(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)}),1-\pi_1(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)})-\pi_2(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)})\right),\quad i=1,\ldots,N.$$

When studying the robustness of the model with $p\%$ of outliers we will consider

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{(i}\sim\mathcal{M}\left(1;\pi_1(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)}),\pi_2(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)}),1-\pi_1(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)})-\pi_2(x_1^{(i)},x_2^{(i)})\right),\quad i=1,\ldots,\left[\frac{p}{100}N\right]$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{y}^{(j}\sim\mathcal{M}\left(1;1-\pi_1(x_1^{(j)},x_2^{(j)})-\pi_2(x_1^{(j)},x_2^{(j)}),\pi_1(x_1^{(j)},x_2^{(j)}),\pi_2(x_1^{(j)},x_2^{(j)})\right),\quad j=\left[\frac{p}{100}N\right]+1,\ldots,N.$$

Results for the simulation study with 500 samples and different vaues of the sample size N for MPDEs with tuning parameter $\lambda\in\{0,0.1,0.2,0.3,0.5,0.7,0.9\}$ are shown in Figure 5. It is important

Table 5: Minimum density power divergence estimators for mamography data with and without outliers (observations $3, 101, 108, 116, 131$ and 136) in liver enzyme data

	With Outliers				Without Outliers			
λ	$\widehat{\beta}_1^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{AST1}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{ALT1}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{GLDH1}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_1^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{AST1}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{ALT1}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{GLDH1}^{\lambda}$
0	-11.3562	-5.6253	8.7928	-2.6974	-13.7400	-6.0662	9.8171	-2.9305
0.1	-11.9074	-8.2968	12.0207	-3.7737	-13.7704	-11.9607	17.4944	-6.8940
0.2	-13.9013	-8.8064	13.0695	-4.1168	-14.3529	-12.2444	17.8452	-6.8712
0.3	-12.2642	-9.7634	13.6570	-3.9701	-15.3101	-11.7853	16.7262	-5.0802
0.5	-19.7314	-8.4364	13.9747	-4.3414	-32.3112	-10.4116	19.7954	-7.8408
0.7	-20.2738	-8.2416	13.8016	-4.1064	-21.8045	-9.2977	16.1602	-6.3050
0.9	-15.9960	-9.8613	14.085	-3.1146	-25.5161	-9.3104	16.2868	-5.1840
λ	$\widehat{\beta}_2^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{AST2}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{ALT2}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{GLDH2}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_2^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{AST2}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{ALT2}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{GLDH2}^{\lambda}$
0	6.0838	-6.6832	6.2269	-2.3655	5.7237	-7.0629	6.6722	-2.3064
0.1	6.7921	-8.9577	8.7550	-3.1893	7.9148	-12.4001	13.1958	-5.6809
0.2	7.7503	-9.7336	9.4087	-3.4241	8.0888	-12.9810	13.2378	-4.8349
0.3	7.5506	-10.4368	10.1915	-3.4620	8.1183	-12.1101	11.7976	-3.5897
0.5	10.1578	-10.1466	9.1995	-3.3291	12.4949	-11.5529	10.2186	-3.6970
0.7	10.3416	-9.9920	8.9252	-3.145	9.4703	-9.9344	9.3999	-3.6731
0.9	8.8516	-10.7851	9.8726	-2.7130	11.0658	-10.3511	8.8947	-2.6976
λ	$\widehat{\beta}_3^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{AST3}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{ALT3}^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{\beta}_{GLDH3}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_3^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{AST3}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{ALT3}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{\beta}_{GLDH3}^{\lambda}$
0	-5.8146	-1.4866	2.0449	1.1873	-6.7381	-2.1027	2.6535	1.5256
0.1	-5.9428	-2.1120	2.7574	1.1689	-6.8763	-2.8613	3.6163	1.3250
0.2	-6.0419	-2.2494	2.9226	1.1696	-6.9709	-2.8159	3.5948	1.3484
0.3	-6.0837	-2.7485	3.3916	1.2724	-6.4149	-3.5845	4.1865	1.5139
0.5	-7.2092	-2.7256	3.5795	1.3007	-8.5194	-3.1961	4.2202	1.4999
0.7	-7.9578	-2.9992	3.9547	1.3981	-6.8510	-2.9633	3.6638	1.4231
0.9	-6.7793	-3.4111	4.1136	1.4402	-8.4754	-3.6218	4.5947	1.5834

Table 6: Estimated mean deviations of the predicted probabilities with respect to the observed frequencies for the mammography data with and without outliers, liver enzyme data

	With Outliers					Without Outliers				
λ	$\widehat{md}_1^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_2^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_3^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_4^{\lambda}$	$\overline{\widehat{md}}^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{md}_1^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{md}_2^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{md}_3^{\lambda}$	${}^*\widehat{md}_4^{\lambda}$	${}^*\overline{\widehat{md}}^{\lambda}$
0	0.0810	0.1041	0.1922	0.1867	0.1410	0.0739	0.0970	0.1759	0.1704	0.1293
0.1	0.0732	0.0899	0.1831	0.1694	0.1289	0.0656	0.0796	0.1643	0.1512	0.1152
0.2	0.0677	0.0834	0.1791	0.1656	0.1240	0.0651	0.0772	0.1663	0.151	0.1149
0.3	0.0702	0.0831	0.1753	0.1586	0.1218	0.0622	0.0748	0.1657	0.1479	0.1126
0.5	0.0596	0.0750	0.1653	0.1548	0.1137	0.0501	0.0667	0.153	0.1447	0.1036
0.7	0.0597	0.0748	0.1603	0.1497	0.1111	0.0557	0.0758	0.1609	0.154	0.1116
0.9	0.0635	0.0761	0.1657	0.1484	0.1135	0.0540	0.0707	0.1540	0.1431	0.1054



Figure 2: Comparison bettween predicted probabilities of the response variable, for MLE (left) and MDPE whith $\lambda = 0.7$ (right), with and without outliers (blue and ornge points, respectively).

to notice than when $\lambda = 0$, we have the MLE. When working with pure data, MLE presents the most efficient behaviour with the least MSE for each sample sizes, while MDPDEs with large value of λ present larger MSEs. On the other hand, for contaminated data, the behaviour of MDPDEs is almost the opposite, the best behaviour (least MSE) is obtained for medium values of the tuning parameter λ. This is more clear when the sample size increases.



Figure 3: P-values of Wald-type tests for testing $H_0 : \beta_{SYMPT11} = \beta_{SYMPT12} = 0$ in mammography data

Table 7: Mean deviations between predicted probabilities with and without outliers,liver enzyme data

λ	$\widehat{md}_1^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_2^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_3^{\lambda}$	$\widehat{md}_4^{\lambda}$	$\overline{\widehat{md}}^{\lambda}$
0	0.0115	0.0103	0.0256	0.0242	0.0179
0.1	0.0130	0.0223	0.0316	0.0306	0.0244
0.2	0.0146	0.0187	0.0222	0.0226	0.0195
0.3	0.0126	0.0139	0.017	0.0177	0.0153
0.5	0.0138	0.0121	0.0193	0.0152	0.0151
0.7	0.0120	0.0134	0.0129	0.0113	0.0124
0.9	0.0167	0.0170	0.0228	0.0128	0.0173



Figure 4: P-values of Wald-type tests for testing $H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_{AST2} = 0$ in liver enzyme data.

6.2 Performance of the MDPDE based Wald-type tests

In this section we are going to establish empirically some of the strong robustness properties of the MDPDE based Wald-type tests for the PLRM. With this purpose we will consider the same model



Figure 5: MSEs of MDPDEs for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ for the pure data (left) and for the contaminated data (right).

than in the previous section.

Our interest was in studying the observed level (measured as the proportion of test statistics exceeding the corresponding chi-square critical value) of the test under the correct null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_{0.2} = 0.6$. The result for pure data is given in Figure 6 (left) while the result for contaminated data with 7% of outliers is given in Figure 6 (right). Here the test for $\lambda = 0$ is the classical Wald test for the PLRM and the horizontal lines represent the nominal level of 0.05. We must notice that all the tests considered are conservative, especially for small and medium values of λ. When contamined data is considered, the level of the classical Wald test as well as the MDPDE based Wald-type tests for small values of λ break down, while the MDPDE based Wald-type tests for medium and large positive values of λ present much more stability in its level. To investigate the power of the tests (obtained in a similar manner than the level) for pure and contaminated data we have changed the alternative hypothesis to $\beta_{02} = 1.35$. Results observed in Figure 6 show how, when pure data is considered, the classical Wald test presents the best behaviour, while when outliers are introduced in the data, Wald-type tests for large positive values of λ lead to better results.



Figure 6: Simulated levels and powers of different Wald-type tests for the pure data (left) and for the contaminated data (right).

7 Concluding Remarks

The Polytomous logistic regression model is an extensively applied model in many different areas, including health and life sciences. This help us to analyze a nominal qualitative response which takes values in a set of unordered categories. Although the classical inference procedures based on the MLE are known to have asymptotic optimal properties, they are highly non-robust against outliers in data. So, the need of robust procedures is a default requirement for practical applications due to the presence of potential outlying observations in many cases. In this paper we have developed a new family of estimators, MDPDEs, as a robust generalization of the MLE for the PLRM where we have explored the "nice" robustness properties of the DPD measure. Based on these estimators, a family of Wald-type test statistics has also been introduced for testing linear hypotheses under the PLRM and their robust properties have been studied theoretically. The study of two practical data examples from medical sciences as well as the simulation results give us numerical evidences that these theoretical advantages of our proposed inference procedures indeed translate in practice for real gains in many applications.

Acknowledgements. This research is partially supported by Grant MTM2012-33740, MTM2015-67057-P from Ministerio de Economia y Competitividad (Spain).
The research of Abhik Ghosh is supported by the research Grant No. DST/ INSPIRE Faculty Award /2016/DST/INSPIRE/04/2016/000130 from Department of Science & Technology, Govt. of India.

Appendix

Proof of Theorem 3

The MDPDE of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$, is obtained by solving the system of equations $\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} d_\lambda\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right) = \mathbf{0}_{dk}$, and then it is also obtained from $\boldsymbol{u}_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = \mathbf{0}_{dk}$, where

$$\boldsymbol{u}_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) = -\frac{N^{\lambda+1}}{\lambda+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} d_\lambda\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{p}}, \boldsymbol{p}\left(\ \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{u}_{\lambda,i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right),$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{u}_{\lambda,i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) &= -\frac{N^{\lambda+1}}{\lambda+1}\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} d_\lambda\left(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right) = \sum_{l=1}^{d+1} \frac{\partial \pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\ \boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \left(\frac{y_{il}}{\pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta})} - 1\right) \pi_l^\lambda(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}) \\ &= \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \boldsymbol{h}_{2,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{h}_{2,\lambda}\left((s_1,\ldots,s_{d+1})^T, (t_1,\ldots,t_{d+1})^T\right) = \left(\left(\tfrac{s_1}{t_1} - 1\right) t_1^\lambda, \cdots, \left(\tfrac{s_{d+1}}{t_{d+1}} - 1\right) t_{d+1}^\lambda\right).$$

On the other hand and taking into account that

$$\frac{\partial \pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \beta_{uv}} = x_{iu}\pi_l(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta})\left(\delta_{lv} - \pi_v(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta})\right), \qquad u = 1,...,k, v = 1,...,d,$$

we get

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\pi}(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\boldsymbol{I}_{d\times d}, \mathbf{0}_{d\times 1})\, \boldsymbol{\Delta}(\boldsymbol{\pi}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)) \otimes \boldsymbol{x}_i, \tag{25}$$

and the expression of $\boldsymbol{u}_{\lambda,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ can be rewritten as (7).

Proof of Theorem 4

From Theorem 3.1 of Ghosh and Basu (2013), we get the first part on consistency as well as

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{N,\lambda}^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\, \boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\sqrt{N}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right) \underset{N\to\infty}{\overset{L}{\to}} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{I}),$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{N,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} \boldsymbol{u}_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})\boldsymbol{u}_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})^T f_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})^{1+\lambda},$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{N,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[\sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} \boldsymbol{u}_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})\boldsymbol{u}_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})^T f_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})^{1+2\lambda} - \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\,\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^T\right],$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{y}} \boldsymbol{u}_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta}) f_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})^{1+\lambda},$$

with $\boldsymbol{u}_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \nabla \ln f_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})$. Then the second part of the theorem follows by simplifying above matrices using the form of $f_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta})$ from (8) and (9) and noting that $\boldsymbol{u}_i(\boldsymbol{y},\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \left(y^* - \boldsymbol{\pi}^*\left(\boldsymbol{x}_i^T\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right)\otimes \boldsymbol{x}_i$.

Proof of Theorem 6

We have $\boldsymbol{L}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l} = \boldsymbol{L}^T\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right)$ and

$$\sqrt{N}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right) \underset{N\to\infty}{\overset{L}{\to}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)),$$

with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = \lim_{N\to\infty}\boldsymbol{M}_{N,\lambda}(\widehat{\beta}_\lambda) = \boldsymbol{J}_\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\,\boldsymbol{V}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\,\boldsymbol{J}_\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$. Therefore

$$\sqrt{N}\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l}\right) \underset{N\to\infty}{\overset{L}{\to}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\,\boldsymbol{L}\right)$$

and the asymptotic distribution of $W_N\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right)$ is a chi-square distribution with s degrees of freedom because

$$\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\,\boldsymbol{L}\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{J}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^{-1}\,\boldsymbol{K}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\,\boldsymbol{J}_\lambda(\,\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)^{-1}\,\boldsymbol{L}\right)^{-1} = \boldsymbol{I}_{dk\times dk}.$$

Proof of Theorem 7

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*) &= \Pr\left(W_N\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right) > \chi^2_{r,\alpha}\right) = \Pr\left(N\left(l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda) - l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right) > \chi^2_{dk,\alpha} - N l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right)\\ &= \Pr\left(\sqrt{N}\left(l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda) - l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right) > \frac{\chi^2_{dk,\alpha}}{\sqrt{N}} - \sqrt{N} l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now we are going to get the asymptotic distribution of the random variable $\sqrt{N}\left(l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda) - l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right)$.

It is clear that $l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda)$ and $l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)$ have the same asymptotic distribution because $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{P} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*$. A first Taylor expansion of $l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)$ at $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda$ around $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ gives

$$l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*) - l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*) = \left(\frac{\partial l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)^T_{\boldsymbol{\beta}=\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^*}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right) + o_p\left(\left\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\right\|\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{N}\left(l_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda) - l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\right) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{L} N\left(0, \sigma_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)^2\right)$$

being

$$\sigma_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)^2 = \left(\frac{\partial l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)^T_{\boldsymbol{\beta}=\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\left(\frac{\partial l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)_{\boldsymbol{\beta}=\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}.$$

But

$$\left(\frac{\partial l_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)^T_{\boldsymbol{\beta}=\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^*} = 2\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^* - \boldsymbol{l}\right)^T\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\,\boldsymbol{L}\right)^{-1}\boldsymbol{L}^T.$$

Now the result follows.

Proof of Theorem 9

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{L}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l} &= \boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_N - l + \boldsymbol{L}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\\ &= \boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{L}^T N^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{d} - l + \boldsymbol{L}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\\ &= \boldsymbol{L}^T N^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{d} + \boldsymbol{L}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\boldsymbol{L}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l} = \boldsymbol{L}^T N^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{d} + \boldsymbol{L}^T(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N).$$

We know, under $H_{1,N}$ that

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}_{dk}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}_N)\right)$$

and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_N \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{} \boldsymbol{\beta}^0$ therefore,

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{\beta}_N) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}_{dk}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^0)\right)$$

and

$$\sqrt{N}(\boldsymbol{L}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l}) \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\boldsymbol{L}^T\ \boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^0)\boldsymbol{L}\right).$$

But we know: "If $\boldsymbol{Z} \in \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is a symmetric projection of rank k and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}$, then $\boldsymbol{Z}^T\boldsymbol{Z}$ is a chi-square distribution with k degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter $\boldsymbol{\mu}^T\boldsymbol{\mu}$." The quadratic form is

$$W_N\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda\right) = \boldsymbol{Z}^T\boldsymbol{Z}$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{Z} = \sqrt{N}\left[\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{M}_{N,\lambda}(\widehat{\beta}_\lambda)\boldsymbol{L}\right]^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{L}^T\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\lambda - \boldsymbol{l})$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{Z} \xrightarrow[N\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} \mathcal{N}\left(\left[\boldsymbol{K}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^0)\ \boldsymbol{K}\right]^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{I}_{r\times r}\right).$$

Hence the application of i) is immediate. The non-centrality parameter is

$$\boldsymbol{d}^T\boldsymbol{L}\left[\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^0)\boldsymbol{L}\right]^{-1}\boldsymbol{L}^T\boldsymbol{d}.$$

For ii), we can follow (22).

References

[1] Aerts, S. & Haesbroeck, G. (2016). Robust asymptotic tests for the equality of multivariate coefficients of variation, *TEST*, doi:10.1007/s11749-016-0504-4

[2] Albert, A. and Harris, E.K. (1987). Multivariate interpretation of clinical laboratory data, New York: Marcel Dekker.

[3] Anderson, J. A. (1972). Separate sample logistic discrimination. *Biometrika,* **59,** 19–35.

[4] Anderson, J. A. (1982). Logistic discrimination. In *Handbook of Statistics,* (P. R. Krishnaiah and L. N. Kanal, Eds)., North-Holland Publ. Comp., 169–191.

[5] Anderson, J. A. (1984). Regression and ordered categorical variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*-Series B**, 46***,*** 1–30.

[6] Basu, A. , Shioya, H. and Park, C. (2011). *The minimum distance approach. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability.* CRC Press, Boca Raton.

[7] Basu, A., Mandal, A., Martín, N. and Pardo, L. (2013). Testing statistical hypotheses based on the density power divergence. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **65**, 319–348.

[8] Basu, A., Mandal, A., Martín, N. and Pardo, L. (2015). Robust tests for the equality of two normal means based on the density power divergence. *Metrika,* **78**, 611–634.

[9] Basu, A., Mandal, A., Martín, N., Pardo, L. (2016). Generalized Wald-type tests based on minimum density power divergence estimators. *Statistics,* **50**, 1–26.

[10] Begg, C.B. and Gray, R. (1984). Calculations of polychotomous logistic regression estimates using individualized regressions. *Biometrika*, **71**, 1-18.

[11] Bertens, L. C. M., Moons, K. G. M., Rutten, F. H. van Mourik, I., Hoes, A. W. and Reitsma, J. B. (2015). A nomogram was developed to enhance the use of multinomial logistic regression modeling in diagnostic research, *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, **71**, 51–57.

[12] Biesheuvel, C.J., Vergouwe, Y., Steyerberg, E.W., Grobbee, D.E.,Moons, K.G. (2008) Polytomous logistic regression analysis could be applied more often in diagnostic research *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, **61**, 125-134.

[13] Blizzard, L. and Hosmer, D. W. (2007). The Log Multinomial Regression Model for Nominal Outcomes with More than Two Attributes, *Biometrical Journal*, **49**, 889–902.

[14] Bull, S.B., Greenwood, C.M.T., and Donner, A. (1994). Eficiency of reduced logistic regression models. *The Canadian Journal of Statistics*, **22**, 319-334.

[15] Bull, S. B. , Lewinger, J. P. and Lee, S. S. F. (2007). Confidence intervals for multinomial logistic regression in sparse data, *Statistics in Medicine*, **26**, 903–918.

[16] Daniels, M. J. and Gatsonis, C. (1997) Hierarchical polytomous regression models with applications to health services research, *Statistics in Medicine,* **16**, 2311–2325.

[17] Dey, S., Raheem, E. and Lu, Z. (2016). Multilevel multinomial logistic regression model for identifying factors associated with anemia in children 6–59 months in northeastern states of India, *Cogent Mathematics* , **3**, 1-12.

[18] Dreassi, D. (2007). Polytomous Disease Mapping to Detect Uncommon Risk Factors for Related Diseases, *Biometrical Journal,* **49**, 520–529.

[19] Ghosh, A., Basu, A. (2013). Robust Estimation for Independent but Non-Homogeneous Observations using Density Power Divergence with application to Linear Regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **7**, 2420–2456.

[20] Ghosh, A., Basu, A. (2015). Robust Estimation in Generalized Linear Models: The density power divergence, *TEST,* **25**, 269-290.

[21] Ghosh, A., Basu, A. and Pardo, L. (2015). On the robustness of a divergence based test of simple statistical hypotheses, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference,* **161**, 91–108.

[22] Ghosh, A., Mandal, A., Martín, N. and Pardo, L. (2016). Influence Analysis of Robust Wald-type Tests. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis,* **147**, 102–126.

[23] Gupta, A. K., Kasturiratna, D.,Nguyen, T. and Pardo, L. (2006a). A new family of BAN estimators for polytomous logistic regression models based on ϕ-divergence measures. Statistical Methods & Applications, **15**, 159–176.

[24] Gupta, A. K., Nguyen, T. and Pardo, L. (2006b). Inference procedures for polytomous logistic regression models based on ϕ-divergence measures. Mathematical Methods of Statistics, **15**, 269–288.

[25] Gupta, A. K. and Pardo, L. (2007). Phi-divergences and polytomous logistic regression models: an overview. *Journal of Statististical Planning and Inference,* **137**, 3513–3524.

[26] Gupta, A. K.; Nguyen, T.; Pardo, L. (2008). Residuals for polytomous logistic regression models based on ϕ-divergence test statistics. *Statistics* **42**, 495–514.

[27] Hampel, F. R., Ronchetti, E., Rousseeuw, P. J., and Stahel W.(1986). *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions.* New York, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

[28] Hansen, L. P. (1982). Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators. *Econometrica*, **50**, 1029–1054

[29] Hayashi, F.(2000). *Econometrics.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

[30] Hosmer, David W., Lemeshow, Stanley. (2000). *Applied logistic regression.* Wiley, New York, N.Y

[31] Huber, P. J. (1983). Minimax aspects of bounded-influence regression (with discussion). *JASA*, **78**, 66-80.

[32] Ke, Y. , Fu, B. and Zhang, W. (2016). Semi-varying coefficient multinomial logistic regression for disease progression risk prediction. *Statistics in Medicine*, **35**, 4764–4778.

[33] Lesaffre, E. (1986). Logistic discrimination analysis with application in electrocardiography. *Doctoral Thesis.* University of Leuven.

[34] Lesaffre, E.and Albert, A. (1989). Multiple-group logistic regression diagnostic. *Applied Statistics,* **38,** 425–440.

[35] Liu, I. and Agresti, A. (2005). The analysis of ordered categorical data: an overview and a survey of recent developments. With discussion and a rejoinder by the authors. *Test* , **14**, 1, 1–73.

[36] Martín, N. (2014).Using Cook's distance in polytomous logistic regression. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, **68**, 84–115.

[37] McCullagh, P. (1980). Regression models for ordinary data. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*-Series B, **42,** 109–142.

[38] Muñoz-Pichardo, J. M. ; Enguix-Gonzalez, A.; Muñoz-García, J. and Moreno-Rebollo, J. L. (2011). Infuence analysis on discriminant coordinates. *Communications in Statistics(Simulation and Computation),* **40,** .793-807.

[39] Nelder, J. A. and Wedderburn, R. W. M. (1972). *Generalized Linear Models.* London, Chapman & Hall.

[40] Pardo, L. (2005). *Statistical Inference Based on Divergence Measures. Statistics: Texbooks and Monographs.* Chapman & Hall/CRC, New York.

[41] Rom, M. and Cohen, A. (1995). Estimation in the polytomous logistic regression models, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference,* **43**, 341-353.

[42] Ronchetti, E. and Trojani, F.(2001). Robust inference with gmm estimators. *Journal of Econometrics*, **101**, 37–69.

[43] Rousseeuw, P. J. and Ronchetti, E. (1979) The influence curve for tests. *Research Report* **21**, Fachgruppe fur Statistik, ETH Zurich.

[44] Victoria-Feser, M. and Ronchetti, E. (1997). Robust estimation for grouped data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* , **92,** 333–340.

[45] Wang, X. (2014). Modified generalized method of moments for a robust estimation of polytomous logistic model. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.467.